



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,727	06/27/2001	Scott Swix	60027.0018US01/BS01040	4789

39262 7590 10/19/2006

MERCHANT & GOULD BELLSOUTH CORPORATION
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

TRAN, HAI V

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/892,727

Applicant(s)

SWIX ET AL.

Examiner

Hai Tran

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3,11 and 23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-10,12-22 and 24-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/29/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/08/2006 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 08/08/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because amended claim 1 with added limitation "wherein uploading the second diagnostic agent deletes the first diagnostic agent, thereby conserving memory resources"; independent claim 21 with added limitation "wherein uploading the second diagnostic agent replaces the first diagnostic agent, thereby conserving memory resources" and the combination of claim 26 with limitation "deleting the at least one first diagnostic software agent upon performing the at least one troubleshooting action, thereby conserving memory resources" and claim 27 with limitation "conveying at least one second diagnostic software agent in response to detecting that the at least one first diagnostic software agent is not operational on the at least one device at the remote site" are not described in the specification. As such, Applicant argument is moot.

Specification

The amendment filed 08/08/2006 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:

Additional disclosure, "It should be appreciated that between steps 426 and 428 the diagnostic software may be removed to conserve valuable memory resources."

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-2, 4-5; 21-22, 24 and claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Limitation "wherein uploading the second diagnostic agent deletes the first diagnostic agent, thereby conserving memory resources" in independent claims 1 "wherein uploading the second diagnostic agent replaces the first diagnostic agent, thereby conserving memory resources" in independent claim 21 are not described in the specification.

Because claim 27 depends to independent claim 26, the combination of independent claim 26 with limitation “deleting the at least one first diagnostic software agent upon performing the at least one troubleshooting action, thereby conserving memory resources” and dependent claim 27 with limitation “conveying at least one second diagnostic software agent in response to detecting that the at least one first diagnostic software agent is not operational on the at least one device at the remote site” is not described in the specification.

Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. Since claim 27 depends on independent claim 26, it's unclear how the step claimed in claim 27 is able to “detecting that the at least one first diagnostic software agent is not operational on the at least one device at the remote site” since independent claim 26 requires “deleting that at least one first diagnostic software agent upon performing the at least one trouble shooting action, thereby conserving memory resources”.

In another word, the first diagnostic software agent upon performing the at least one trouble shooting action, the first software agent is deleted from the memory for conserving memory; therefore, it's unclear how the second diagnostic software agent in claim 27 is able to detect the deleted first diagnostic software agent from the memory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-22, 24-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Middeke et al. (US 6445907) in view of Rangarajan (US 5987514).

Claim 1, A method for analyzing the operation of a media delivery device (Col. 2, lines 1-20), the method comprising the steps of:

determining whether a network connection is functional (by monitoring whether a service request is received from the service center 28; Col. 6, lines 1-15);
determining whether a 1st diagnostic agent is functional, in response to a determination that the network connection is functional (by detecting a service request at step 124, Col. 6, lines 17-18) ;

causing the 1st diagnostic agent to collect diagnostic data associated with the media delivery device (STB), in response to a determination that the 1st diagnostic agent is functional (gathering diagnostic information; Col. 6, lines 19-30) ;

analyzing the diagnostic data to determine an operational problem associated with the media delivery device (STB) (service center analyses the received diagnostic information; Col. 10, lines 60-63 and service technician remotely trouble-shoot and reconfigured the receiver; Col. 10, lines 35-55).

Middeke further discloses upon the diagnostic information has been transferred to the center, the service center can send commands to the receiver to delete the 1st diagnostic agent (service request) by resetting the receiver to factory default (Col. 10, lines 35-41), thereby conserving memory resource.

Middeke does not clearly disclose "uploading a second diagnostic agent to the media delivery device in response to a determination that the first diagnostic agent is not functional"

Rangarajan discloses uploading a second diagnostic agent to the receiver in response to a determination that the first diagnostic agent is not functional (Note: "not functional" reads on the diagnostic agent is not able to provide a precise error result. Col. 5, lines 64-Col. 6, lines 15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Middeke diagnostic system to further uploading 2nd diagnostic agent, as taught by Rangarajan so to troubleshoot or narrow down the cause of a failure (Col. 2, lines 40-42).

Claim 2 Middeke in view of Rangarajan further discloses the step of uploading the first diagnostic agent to the media delivery device (STB) over an alternative network connection, in response to a determination that the network connection is not functional (reads on Middeke in which the remote technician at the remote service, i.e., workstation 30, by analyzing the diagnostic information received from the receiver, Col. 3, lines 40-Col. 15, the remote technician able to determine whether or not the network connection is functional. In view of the result, the remote

technician able to reset the receiver to factory default including the first diagnostic agent that was pre-loaded by default based on the network communication status; Col. 10, lines 35-63; for example if the strength of the satellite transponder is weak, the only way to communicate between the receiver 24 and the remote service center 30 is through the communication line 32 of Fig. 1 so the technician able to troubleshoot the receiver 24).

Claim 4, Middeke further discloses the step of remedying the operational problem (Col. 10, lines 35-42).

Claim 5 , "the step of uploading a second diagnostic agent to the media delivery device, in response to a determination that the network connection is not functional" is analyzed with respect to claim 1 in which Middeke's remote technician at the remote service, i.e., workstation 30, by analyzing the diagnostic information received from the receiver, Col. 3, lines 40-Col. 15, the remote technician able to determine whether or not the network connection is functional. In view of the result, the Middeke's remote technician in view of Rangarajan able to uploading a second diagnostic agent to the media delivery device through another communication link.

Claim 6 is analyzed with respect to claim 1.

Claim 7, Middeke further discloses wherein the performance problem is also associated with a 2nd device functionality connected to the media distribution device (Col. 3, lines 40-Col. 4, lines 15 that has plurality of status of plurality connected devices to the receiver, i.e., smartcard status.

Claim 8, Middeke further discloses the media distribution device is a STB (see Fig. 2; Col. 4, lines 15-40).

Claim 9, is analyzed with respect to claim 1.

Claim 10, Middeke further discloses wherein the intelligent diagnostic agent is executable in the system memory (Col. 6, lines 18-30).

Claim 12, "wherein the diagnostic service center can determine whether the diagnostic agent is functional" is further by Middeke' as analyzed with respect to claim 1 in which the remote service, i.e., workstation 30, able to receive the diagnostic information from the receiver.

Claim 13, is analyzed with respect to claim 1.

Claim 14, Middeke further discloses wherein the communication link is a broadband communication (see Fig. 1).

Claim 15, Middeke in view of Rangarajan does not clearly disclose the use of an ADSL as communication link.

Official Notice is taken that the use of ADSL is notoriously well known in the art for telephone companies to offer "video dial tone" over twisted pair. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Middeke in view of Rangarajan to use ADSL as communication so to provide to user an alternative way to receive video at high-speed over telephone twisted pair network.

Claim 16, Middeke further discloses wherein the communication link is a satellite connection (see Fig. 1).

Claims 17-18, are analyzed with respect to claim 1.

Claim 19 is analyzed with respect to claim 2.

Claim 20, Middeke further discloses a media delivery service provider operative to transmit a media content stream to a media distribution device (see Fig. 1).

Claims 20, 21, 25, 26 are analyzed with respect to claim 1.

Claims 22 is analyzed with respect to claim 2.

Claim 24 is analyzed with respect to claim 4.

Claim 27, Middeke does not clearly disclose "the step of conveying at least one 2nd diagnostic software agent in response to detecting that the at least one 1st diagnostic software agent is not operational on the at least one device at the remote site."

Rangarajan discloses conveying at least a second diagnostic agent to the receiver in response to detecting that the at least one first diagnostic software agent is not operational (Note: "not operational" reads on the diagnostic agent is not able to provide a precise error result. Col. 5, lines 64-Col. 6, lines 15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Middeke diagnostic system to further uploading 2nd diagnostic agent, as taught by Rangarajan so to troubleshoot or narrow down the cause of a failure (Col. 2, lines 40-42).

Claims 28 and 29 are analyzed with respect to claim 2.

Claim 30, Middeke further discloses wherein the at least one 2nd communication path comprises a wireless link (Col. 3, lines 30-32).

Claim 31, Middeke further discloses wherein the wireless link comprises satellite communication (Col. 3, lines 30-32).

Claim 32, Middeke further discloses wherein code related to the at least one 1st diagnostic software agent is stored in the at least one device at the remote site for diagnostic testing and is later removed to allow more storage during an operational condition of the at least one device (reset to default setting; Col. 10, lines 35-41)

Claim 33, Middeke further discloses wherein the at least one first diagnostic software agent is interactive with a customer through a presentation device (Col. 4, lines 60-67+).

Claim 34, Middeke (Col. 3, lines 40-Col. 4, lines 15) in view of Rangarajan (Col. 6, lines 60-65) further discloses the step of entering identification of the media delivery device in a service log.

Claim 35, Middeke (Col. 4, lines 48-Col. 5, lines 13) in view of Rangarajan further discloses wherein entering the identification of the media delivery device is performed autonomously by the diagnostic agent.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-7305. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

Art Unit: 2623

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher S. Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HT:ht
10/13/2006


HALTRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER